

REMARKS

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are requested. Claims 2-4, 7-8 and 13-21 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended for the sole purpose of including the limitations of canceled claims 7 and 8.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 5-6, and 9-12 as being "obvious", under 35 U.S.C. 103, is respectfully traversed. The Examiner rejects these claims as being unpatentable over Faraoni '531 or Arakawa '857 in combination with Metzger '279. Claims 5-6 and 9-12 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 requires performing a preheating step of directing a high velocity (at least 500 fpm) first heated gas flow to impinge on the workpiece, wherein the workpiece has a longitudinal axis and an electric coil to which a coating material is to be applied in a later step, and wherein the preheating step directs the first heated gas flow substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the workpiece. Claim 1 also requires, during the preheating step, the step of rotating the workpiece about the longitudinal axis.

It is noted that Metzger discloses using a high-velocity heated gas flow to cure a coated substrate 14 which is a sheet material such as plywood (see column 3, line 64 to column 4, line 3). A sheet material such as plywood is not a workpiece having an electric coil to be coated as required by Applicant's claims. There is no suggestion in Metzger to heat a workpiece having an electric coil to be coated, and it would not be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply techniques used to heat-cure coated plywood to preheating a workpiece having an electric coil to be coated. Further, Metzger actually teaches using a high-velocity heated gas flow and rod-type infra-red radiant energy sources 36 and housing sections 34 serving as reflector elements for the energy sources 36 (see column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 1) to heat-cure coated sheet material. There is no more suggestion in the cited art to substitute the high-velocity heated gas flow of Metzger for the low-velocity heated gas flow of Faraoni or for the electric furnace of Arakawa than to substitute the infra-red radiant energy source and reflector of Metzger for the low-velocity heated gas flow of Faraoni or for the electric furnace of Arakawa.

Claim 1 requires performing the step of directing the first heated gas flow to impinge on the workpiece before performing the step of applying a coating material to the electric coil of the

workpiece. Thus, step a) of claim 1 preheats the workpiece before step b) of claim 1 applies the coating material.

The examiner has repeated from the previous office action his allegation that it would have been obvious to have modified Faraoni or Arakawa by substituting the high velocity hot air drying/curing step of Metzger for the ovens of Faraoni or Arakawa. However, as argued by Applicant in the previous amendment, such substitution does not create a process which directs a heated gas flow to impinge on the workpiece before applying a coating material to the electric coil of the workpiece as required by applicant's claims. There is no suggestion in Metzger to preheat the substrate before applying the coating.


In response to Applicant's arguments in the previous amendment, the examiner has alleged in the present office action that it would have been obvious to have substituted the preheating air flow convection step of Faraoni with the high velocity hot air curing step of Metzger "with the expectation of achieving similar success". Applicant respectfully disagrees. As previously mentioned, Metzger cures (post-heats) an already-coated planar substrate (which does not include an electric coil) while Applicant's claims require preheating of a workpiece having an electrical coil to be coated. Faraoni preheats a workpiece with air flow convection. There is no suggestion in Faraoni or Metzger to make the substitution suggested by the examiner. Even if such substitution were made, having the blower 28 of Faraoni blow high velocity hot air would not direct such heated gas flow to impinge the workpiece substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the workpiece as required by Applicant's claims. The blower 28 of Faraoni directs air away from the workpieces. Additionally, even if such substitution were made, neither Faraoni or Metzger disclose preheating the workpiece while rotating the workpiece about the longitudinal axis of the workpiece as required by Applicant's claims. It is noted that while the workpiece 12 of Faraoni may revolve one-quarter or one-half of the way around a wheel pulley of the conveyor 24, the workpiece 12 of Faraoni does not rotate about its longitudinal axis as required by Applicant's claims. An example of the difference between revolving and rotating is the earth's one-year revolution around the sun and the earth's twenty-four hour rotation about its axis. Applicant's preheating with a high-velocity heated gas flow while rotating the workpiece about its longitudinal axis combined with applicant's preheating

Serial No.: 09/781,575
Attorney Docket No.: 550134-077-1
Amendment

with a high-velocity heated gas flow which is substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the workpiece increases the efficiency of the preheating step and is not taught, suggested or described in Faraoni and/or Metzger.

Inasmuch as each of the rejections has been answered by the above remarks and amended claims, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas E. Erickson
Reg. No. 29,530

THOMPSON HINE LLP
2000 Courthouse Plaza NE
10 West Second Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-1758
(937) 443-6814

307020